IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

GILBERT E. ROSALES,

No. C 11-00087 SBA (PR)

APPEALABILITY

Petitioner,

ORDER DENYING PETITION FOR A WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS; AND DENYING CERTIFICATE OF

•

RANDY GROUNDS, Warden,

Respondent.

Petitioner has filed a petition for a writ of habeas corpus under 28 U.S.C. § 2254 claiming that his constitutional rights were violated in connection with a decision by the California Board of Parole Hearings (Board) in 2009 denying him parole. Petitioner specifically claims that the decision does not comport with due process because it is not supported by "some evidence" demonstrating that he poses a current unreasonable threat to the public.

In the context of parole, a prisoner subject to a parole statute similar to California's receives adequate process when he is allowed an opportunity to be heard and is provided with a statement of the reasons why parole was denied. Swarthout v. Cooke, No. 10-333, slip op. at 4-5 (U.S. Jan. 24, 2011). The attachments to the petition show Petitioner received at least this amount of process. The Constitution does not require more. Id. at 5.

Whether the Board's decision was supported by some evidence of current dangerousness is irrelevant in federal habeas. The Supreme Court has made clear that "it is no federal concern . . . whether California's 'some evidence' rule of judicial review (a procedure beyond what the Constitution demands) was correctly applied." <u>Id.</u> at 6.

For the foregoing reasons, the petition for a writ of habeas corpus is DENIED. Pursuant to Rule 11 of the Rules Governing Section 2254 Cases, a certificate of appealability under 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c) is DENIED because it cannot be said that "reasonable jurists would find the district court's assessment of the constitutional claims debatable or wrong." Slack v. McDaniel, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000). Petitioner may seek a certificate of appealability from the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals.

Case 4:11-cv-00087-SBA Document 3 Filed 02/11/11 Page 2 of 3

For the Northern District of California

United States District Court

The Clerk of the Court shall enter judgment in favor of Respondent, terminate all pending motions, and close the file.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: <u>2/9/11</u>

SAUNDRA BROWN ARMSTRONG United States District Judge

 $G:\ \ PRO-SE\ SBA\ HC.11\ Rosales 0087. HC\ Denial-\textbf{2}Cooke. wpd$

	Case 4.11 ev 00007 SBA Bocament S Thea 02/11/11 Tage S 013
1 2 3 4 5	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
6	GILBERT E. ROSALES, Case Number: CV11-00087 SBA
7	
8	Plaintiff, CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE
9	V.
10	RANDY GROUNDS et al,
11	Defendant.
12	
13	I, the undersigned, hereby certify that I am an employee in the Office of the Clerk, U.S. District Court, Northern District of California.
14	That on February 11, 2011, I SERVED a true and correct copy(ies) of the attached, by placing said
15	copy(ies) in a postage paid envelope addressed to the person(s) hereinafter listed, by depositing said envelope in the U.S. Mail, or by placing said copy(ies) into an inter-office delivery receptacle
16	located in the Clerk's office.
17	
18	Gilbert E. Rosales H-06195
19	Salinas Valley State Prison P.O. Box 689
20	Soledad, CA 93960-0689
21	Dated: February 11, 2011 Richard W. Wieking, Clerk
22	By: LISA R CLARK, Deputy Clerk
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	

 $G:\ \ PRO-SE\ SBA\ HC.11\ Rosales 0087. HC\ Denial- \textbf{C}ooke. wpd$